REMARKS

Claims 44-47, 49, 51-53, 63 and 64 are pending in the application. Claims 1-43, 48, 50 and 54-62 were previously canceled.

Claim 44 is amended to include features previously presented in earlier versions of the claims. Claim 63 is rewritten as an independent claim and includes features from claim 44. However, no new features have been introduced in claim 63. Therefore, all of the features provided in amended claims 44 and 63 have been previously considered.

Claims 44-47, 51, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,360 to Odam et al, hereinafter "Odam". Claim 44 is independent. Claims 44 and 63 as amended include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Odam.

Independent claim 44 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap, including automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The window priority is derived from a content of each window of the plurality of windows.

Odam discloses a method and apparatus for arranging windows on a computer display screen, including the steps of assigning a priority to each of a first plurality of windows in a workspace according to a predefined criteria, an active window having the highest priority (col. 3, lines 10-15). The method also includes indenting each window by an indentation distance value from a reference position in the workspace, where the window having the lowest priority is positioned the closest to the reference position, and the window having the highest priority is positioned the furthest from the reference

position and in the visual foreground of the workspace (col. 3, lines 15-23). In another aspect, Odam discloses a method for arranging windows in a workspace including assigning a priority to each of a plurality of windows in the workspace according to a predefined criteria (col. 3, lines 24-28).

In one embodiment, each window is assigned a priority number, initally assigned according to some predetermined criteria, such as the relative time of each window's creation, a user's preference, and the relative importance of each window (col. 7, lines 4-12). In one example, the priority number of each window may be assigned based on a time that each window is created, or based on a preference set by a user (col. 13, lines 47-57).

Odam discloses a method including setting a priority of a window based on an assigned number, according to criteria including a time of each window's creation, a user's preference, or the relative importance of each window. However, Odam does not disclose setting a priority of a window based on a **content of the window**, as provided in claim 44.

Odam does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, "wherein said window priority is derived from a content of each window of said plurality of windows," as recited in claim 44. Therefore, Odam does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44. Thus, claim 44 is not anticipated by Odam.

Claims 45-47 and 51 depend from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 44, claims 45-47 and 51 are not anticipated by Odam.

Independent claim 63 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap based on a user's history of window use. The method includes automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The priority

is derived from one or more criteria for each window selected from the group consisting of: a number of times that a window is accessed during a predetermined time interval, a visibility of a window on the graphical user interface, an amount of scrolling performed on a window, and a user history related to one or more of the criteria.

As described above, Odam discloses a method including setting a priority of a window based on an assigned number, according to criteria including a time of each window's creation, a user's preference, or the relative importance of each window. However, Odam does not disclose setting a priority of a window based on one or more of the following criteria: i) a number of times that a window is accessed during a predetermined time interval, ii) a visibility of a window on the graphical user interface, iii) an amount of scrolling performed on a window, iv) and a user history related to one or more of the criteria.

Odam does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, "wherein said priority is derived from one or more criteria for each window selected from the group consisting of: a number of times that a window is accessed during a predetermined time interval, a visibility of a window on the graphical user interface, an amount of scrolling performed on a window, and a user history related to one or more of said criteria," as recited in claim 63. Therefore, Odam does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 63. Thus, claim 63 is not anticipated by Odam.

Claim 64 depends from claim 63. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 63, claim 64 is not anticipated by Odam.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 44-47, 51, 63 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Odam is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 44-47, 51, 63 and 64 be reconsidered and

withdrawn.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odam in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,559,533 to Bass et al., hereinafter "Bass". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 49 depends from independent claim 44. Claim 44 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap, including automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The window priority is derived from a content of each window of the plurality of windows.

As described above, Odam does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, wherein "said window priority being derived from a content of each window of said plurality of windows," as recited in claim 44. Therefore, Odam does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44.

Bass discloses a method of electronically moving portions of several different images on a CRT screen (col. 2, lines 13-16). The method includes displaying, in response to stored control bits, an entire portion of an image in a high priority viewport and only a non-overlapping portion of an image in a low priority viewport, modifying at least some of the stored control bits to change the priorities of the high and low priority viewports to low and high respectively, and repeating the displaying step, in response to the modified control bits, to display the entire portion of the image in the new high priority viewport and only the non-overlapping portion of the image in the new low priority viewport (col. 2, lines 22-36).

However, Bass does not disclose a method including setting a priority of a window based on a content of the window, as provided in claim 44. Thus, Odam does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, "wherein said window

priority is derived from a content of each window of said plurality of windows," as recited in claim 44.

Therefore, Odam and Bass, whether considered independently or in combination with one another, fail to disclose all of the elements of claim 44. Thus, claim 44 is patentable over the cited combination of Odam and Bass.

Claim 49 depends from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 44, claim 49 is also patentable over the cited combination of Odam and Bass.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 49 as unpatentable over Odam in view of Bass is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 49 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odam. Claims 52 and 53 depend from independent claim 44. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As described above, Odam does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, wherein "said window priority being derived from a content of each window of said plurality of windows," as recited in claim 44. Therefore, Odam does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44. Thus, claim 44 is patentable over Odam.

Claims 52 and 53 depend from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 44, claims 52 and 53 are patentable over Odam.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 52 and 53 as unpatentable over Odam is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 52 and 53 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3-24-05

Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401